



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,751	02/15/2001	A. Christian Tahan	XWRLD-102	1517

7590  
Robert K Tendler  
65 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, MA 02110

01/08/2008

EXAMINER
----------

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,751

Applicant(s)

TAHAN, A. CHRISTIAN

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/6/07 has been entered.

### ***Notice to Applicant***

2. This communication is response to the amendment filed 12/6/07. Claims 1 and 3-18 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg and U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al. in view of US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al.

As per claim 1, Schoenberg teaches a system for assisting in the rapid and secure delivery of medical information directly to the site at which emergency assistance is being performed and which is remote and for uploading information from the remote emergency assistance site relative to the condition of the patient at the remote emergency assistance site, from any hospital

or emergency room (this recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951)) comprising:

- the claimed global database for warehousing patient history information is met by database (122, Fig. 1);

- the claimed server for transmitting a patient history information file to said site once access has been granted is met by the server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35); and

- the claimed computer and display at the site remote from any hospital or emergency room and at which said emergency assistance is being performed, said computer and display being wirelessly connected via a wireless transceiver at said site capable of handling said large size patient history file for displaying said patient history information from information downloaded from said server, said transceiver uploading information about a patient at said remote site to said global database is met by the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone and is located wherever access to a patient's medical record is required such as in an emergency room, ambulance or another doctor's office

(see: column 4, lines 36-51). In addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 33-36). Moreover, the Examiner respectfully submits that insofar as claim 1, merely states "capable of handling said large size patient history file...", the prior art need only show a capability of handling said large size patient history file, and not the actual handling, per se.

Schoenberg fails to explicitly teach:

- the claimed access code assigned to a predetermined patient to permit access to the corresponding patient history information;
- the claimed access code carried by said patient; and
- the claimed access code entry device at said computer and display for the entry for the entry of the access code carried by said patient and for transmittal thereof to said global database, thus to permit the downloading of the patient history information upon authorization, whereby critical medical information is available at the site at which medical assistance is being performed.

Chaco et al. teaches a patient care and communication system using a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67). In addition, Chaco et al. teaches that the memory card (110, Fig. 1a and 1b) is approximately the same size as a credit card, which can be carried by the patient (see: column 7, lines 10-18). Chaco et al. further teaches that the patient station (210, Fig. 2) includes a memory card

reader/writer (412, Fig. 4) into which the memory card (110, Fig. 1) may be inserted (see: column 11, 14-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the memory card using ID numbers to access patient information as taught by Chaco et al. within the method and system for distributing medical information as taught by Schoenberg with the motivation of using a system capable of performing task such as maintaining patient medical data to provide maximum patient care (see: Chaco et al.: column 3, lines 8-13).

Schoenberg and Chaco et al. fail to explicitly teach uploading and downloading information to the global database.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, Zak et al. teaches that all information related to the emergency is retained and electronic transferred to the hospital's computer system. Furthermore, Zak et al. teaches that the system creates SOL to load/update the ODBC-compliant database (see: paragraph 92).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include a hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information as taught by Zak et al. with the system of Schoenberg and Chaco et al. with the motivation of providing EMS personnel with a compact, convenient, durable, and inexpensive device that strongly supports their efforts to provide quality out-of-hospital care (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 36).

As per claim 3, Schoenberg teaches a wireless transceiver includes a wireless phone having downloading and uploading capability and having a display on which said information is presented. This feature is met the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51). The Examiner considers the cellular telephone to have the capability of downloading and uploading information.

As per claim 4, Schoenberg teach the claimed wireless transceiver includes a personal digital assistant. This feature is met the request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

As per claim 5, Schoenberg, and Chaco et al. teach a request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

Schoenberg and Chaco fail to explicitly teach modifying the data in said global database, whereby patient diagnosis and treatment can be uploaded to said global database.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, the apparatus (10, Fig. 1) includes a basic set of data collection forms such as a problem and treatment form (see: paragraph 57, 60 and 62). In addition, when the patient (2, Fig. 1) is transported to an emergency department (20, Fig. 1), the patient report (15, Fig. 1) is wirelessly transmitted to an emergency department laser printer and the emergency staff (25, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 56). Additionally, Zak et al. teaches that all

information related to the emergency is retained and electronic transferred to the hospital's computer system. Furthermore, Zak et al. teaches that the system creates SQL to load/update the ODBC-compliant database (see: paragraph 92).

The obviousness of combining the teachings of Zak et al. with the system of Chaco et al. are discussed in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

As per claim 7, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed access code is in the form of a machine readable code and wherein said access code entry device includes a machine code reader. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 8, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed machine readable code is a bar code and wherein said access code entry device includes a bar code reader. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 9, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach the claimed global database is subdivided into a number of databases, each located in a different geographic region and each having a separate server, with the information from said global database being shared between the subdivided databases and wherein each subdivided database has an associated server, such that rapid transmission of patient information is assured regardless of the location of the patient. This limitation is met by the reference databases for drugs and protocols accessed by the emergency medical technician to support the collection of data (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 19). In

addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 33-36). Furthermore, the setup system (110, Fig. 1) can be located at the patient's physician office (see: Schoenberg: column 4, lines 46-48).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al. and US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,992,890 to Simcox.

As per claim 6, Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. teach an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 55).

Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. fail to explicitly teach transmitting said prescription to a pharmacy for filling.

Simcox teaches a hand held remote computer including means for electronically communicating to a host computer which facilitates verification of the data entry and icon selection and provides for electronic communication with a remote pharmaceutical distribution point (see: column 2, lines 37-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the hand held computer that provides electronic communication with a remote pharmaceutical distribution point as taught by Simcox with the system as taught by Schoenberg, Chaco et al. and Zak et al. with the motivation of providing a prescription media which includes a plurality of visual indicia to give positive correlation

between a prescribed pharmaceutical and the application of that pharmaceutical (see: column 2, lines 5-9).

5. Claims 10-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg in view of US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al.

As per claim 10, Schoenberg teaches a method of providing patient histories to a site remote from any hospital or emergency room and at the location of a patient in need of medical attention, comprising the steps of:

--the claimed providing patient histories at a centralized location in a global database coupled to the Internet by a server is met by the setup system having a computer processor and associated memory for inputting the medical information to the database (see: column 3, lines 41-44). In addition, the system (100, Fig. 1) includes a setup system (110, Fig. 1), server system (120, Fig. 1) and request system (130, Fig. 1) all connected to a common communications (see: column 4, lines 15-17). In addition, Schoenberg teaches a request system (130, Fig. 1) which can be any wired or wireless device that can be connected to a communication network, such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or a cellular telephone and is located wherever access to a patient's medical record is required such as in an emergency room, ambulance or another doctor's office (see: column 4, lines 36-51).

Schoenberg fails to explicitly teach the claimed uploading patient information from said site.

Zak et al. teaches an hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for capturing and storing emergency information by an emergency medical technician (5, Fig. 1) at the site of the medical emergency (2, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 55). In addition, the apparatus (10, Fig. 1) includes a basic set of data

collection forms such as a problem and treatment form (see: paragraph 57, 60 and 62).

Additionally, when a patient (2, Fig. 1) is transported to an emergency department (20, Fig. 1), the patient report (15, Fig. 1) is wirelessly transmitted to an emergency department laser printer and the emergency staff (25, Fig. 1) (see: paragraph 56).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include a hand held apparatus (10, Fig. 1) for uploading patient information from the site of the accident as taught by Zak et al. within the method and system for distributing medical information as taught by Schoenberg with the motivation of providing EMS personnel with a compact, convenient, durable, and inexpensive device that strongly supports their efforts to provide quality out-of-hospital care (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 36).

As per claim 11, Schoenberg teach the claimed patient history is only transmitted when authorized by the patient. This feature is met by the user that can be a patient or the patient's physician generates security access codes at step 202 to provide varying access to the patient's medical records (see: column 4, lines 54-57). In addition, Schoenberg teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35).

As per claim 18, Schoenberg, and Zak et al. teach the claimed global database is decentralized through the use of regional databases, each having its own server and each carrying patient histories so that access to the patient history can be on a real time basis to permit timely treatment. This limitation is met by the reference databases for drugs and protocols accessed by the emergency medical technician to support the collection of data (see: Zak et al.: paragraph 19). In addition, when a patient's medical record is needed, the requestor inputs to the server

system (120, Fig. 1) through request system (130, Fig. 1) and over network (160, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 33-36). In addition, Schoenberg, and Zak et al. teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35). The Examiner considers that once the server identifies the requestor information then the medical information is transmitted in real time.

6. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,417 to Schoenberg and US 2002/0004729 to Zak et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,544 to Chaco et al.

As per claim 12, Schoenberg and Zak et al. fail to teach the claimed authorization is in the form of an access code carried by the patient.

Chaco et al. teaches a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the memory card using ID numbers to access patient information as taught by Chaco et al. with the system as taught by Schoenberg and Zak et al. with the motivation of using a system capable of performing task such as maintaining patient medical data to provide maximum patient care (see: Chaco et al.: column 3, lines 8-13).

As per claim 13, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is obtained from the patient and is transmitted to the server associated with said global database. This feature is met by the user that can be a patient or the patient's physician generates security

access codes at step 202 to provide varying access to the patient's medical records (see: Schoenberg: column 4, lines 54-57). In addition, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teaches a server system (120, Fig. 1) that determines requestor identification and transmits medical information to the request system (130, Fig. 1) (see: Schoenberg: column 5, lines 47 to column 6, lines 35). Additionally, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach a memory card that contains patient identification information such as ID numbers (116, Fig. 1), which used to access patient information from a local or main computer (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18 and 50-67).

As per claim 14, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is carried by the patient. This limitation is met by the memory card (110, Fig. 1a and 1b) is approximately the same size as a credit card, which can be carried by the patient (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18).

As per claim 15, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is in the form of a bar code and wherein a bar code reader is used to read the access code and transmit the access code to the server associated with said global database. This limitation is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 16, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is carried on a bracelet. This feature is met by the patient's bracelet with a bar-coded ID number that is read with a bar-code reader or the portable nurse station bar-coded reader (see: Chaco et al.: column 28, lines 32-37).

As per claim 17, Schoenberg, Zak et al. and Chaco et al. teach the claimed access code is imprinted on a card adapted to be carried. This limitation is met by the memory card (110, Fig. 1) that includes printed ID numbers on the front (see: Chaco et al.: column 7, lines 10-18).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/6/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed herein below in the order in which they appear in the response filed 12/6/07.

In response the Applicant argues that it has long since been held that month-to-month activity is clearly sufficient to establish diligence and that no excuse therefor is necessary in the subject case. The Examiner respectfully disagrees that month-to-month activity is sufficient enough to establish diligence, for example the MPEP states “A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. *In re Mulder*, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); *Fitzgerald v. Arbib*, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959). The period during which diligence is required must be accounted for by either affirmative acts or acceptable excuses. *Rebstock v. Flouret*, 191 USPQ 342, 345 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1975); (Court generally reviewed cases on excuses for inactivity including vacation extended by ill health and daily job demands, and held lack of university funding and personnel are not acceptable excuses.); *Litchfield v. Eigen*, 535 F.2d 72, 190 USPQ 113 (CCPA 1976). Therefore, it is the Examiner position that the journal entries which are on a month-to-month basis merely contemplate or consider the idea of using a portable computer to assists an emergency technician with receiving and transmitting patient information at the site of a emergency and the MPEP states “The work relied upon to show reasonable diligence must be directly related to the

reduction to practice of the invention in issue” *Naber v. Cricchi*, 567 F.2d 382, 384, 196 USPQ 294, 296 (CCPA 1977), *cert. denied*, 439 U.S. 826 (1978). As such, it is submitted that the Applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence to establish diligence and has not providing an acceptable excuse for the time lapse between months showing reasonable due diligence.

### ***Conclusion***

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/784751. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

Application/Control Number:  
09/784,751  
Art Unit: 3626

Page 15

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Robert Morgan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3626